



---

## **CREST DRIVE COMMUNITY TEAM CSS PROCESS MEETING SUMMARY**

City of Eugene  
858 Pearl St 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Eugene, Oregon 97401  
(541) 682-5727  
(541) 682-5598 FAX

### **Introduction**

The May 25<sup>th</sup> CDCT meeting was held in the Tykeson at the Eugene Public Library from 7 P.M to 9 P.M. Margot Helphand facilitated the meeting. A participant sign-in sheet is attached on page 6.

The meeting agenda, developed at the previous meeting as specified by the CDCT group agreements, follows:

- 1. Agenda Review**
- 2. Review of May 8<sup>th</sup> City Council Work Session**
- 3. Work Plan Elements**
- 4. Next Steps Planning**
- 5. Communication Items**
- 6. Agenda Development**

The meeting began with a statement read by CDCT committee member Ginny Starling. She described frustrations at being unable to make a statement during the April 19<sup>th</sup> CDCT meeting. Her comments expressed dissatisfaction for the absence of a mechanism in the group agreements allowing comments at the beginning of a meeting. She also expressed concerns that the City of Eugene had already designed roads in the Crest Neighborhood without regard for existing natural features and without resident input.

Margot asked the CDCT to speak to Ginny's comments and concerns. CDCT members responded by suggesting that communication items be moved to the beginning of the meeting while still preserving time at the end of meetings for additional comments and communication items. Several CDCT members reiterated the importance of this suggestion. One member suggested calling it a "check-in and check-out" period; to be held at the beginning and end of each meeting. One concern raised about the addition of a "check-in" period was the increased potential for digression from meeting agendas. In response to Ginny's concerns about preexisting designs and disregard for natural features, City staff noted that the design process will include full participation of the CDCT as well as being inclusive of the neighborhood and broader community; citizen concerns and desires will feed into the design throughout the CSS process.

### **Agenda Review**

There were no questions or comments regarding the agenda developed at the May 4<sup>th</sup> CDCT meeting.

### **Review of May 8<sup>th</sup> City Council Work Session**

City staff discussed the May 8<sup>th</sup> Eugene City Council Work Session in which the City Council was updated on the Context Sensitive Solutions process for the identified street sections of the Crest Drive Area. Lisa Gardner reported back to the CDCT about the PowerPoint presentation she gave to the Council (available on the City's Crest Drive website) and specific items about the process including:

- The history of the process
- The process training meetings with Bill and Josh

- The facilitator chosen for the duration of the process: Margot Helphand
- CSS definition and local and national examples
- Work plan and public involvement plan development
- Timeline (driven by CDCT process)

Lisa described the Council's response as very positive and supportive. The Council voted 8-0 in support of allocating the requested project budget of \$240,000. CDCT member Fred Lorish, who attended the work session, reported back to the group that he was pleased with Lisa Gardner's presentation at the work session and he had nothing to add to her report back to the CDCT.

After the City staff report on the May 8<sup>th</sup> Work Session, Margot asked for any questions or comments from the CDCT. In addition to general positive comments about the report, CDCT members expressed satisfaction with David Kelly's suggestion that the group contact city council about revisiting ACSP standards if it reaches an impasse.

The City of Eugene Public Works Engineering Division has made a video copy of the May 8<sup>th</sup> work session available for CDCT members to borrow (please contact David Roth at 682-5727 to schedule a time to check out the video).

### Work Plan Elements

As directed by the CDCT, City staff developed a potential work plan timeline spanning the next year. The work plan contains more specific details through late summer/early fall of 2006. Beyond October of 2006, fewer specific elements are included to allow for flexibility in the process. The purpose of developing specific work plan elements now is to match the CDCT's goals with tools and methods that will allow the group to reach desired outcomes.



City  
staff

f prepared the work plan outline on a large display using movable sticky notes. These notes describe specific design and engineering elements in addition to context sensitive solution elements. Critical *elements* and desired *outcomes* of the process through October of 2006 (as shown on the display) include the following:

- Public involvement plan framework > public involvement goals and stakeholder ID
- Placemaking activity > engagement/input on context
- Context Sensitive Solutions 101 > Build common language
  
- Identification of data and physical survey parameters > data needs known, existing data acknowledged, proceed w/ physical survey
- Issues identification > common understanding and acknowledgement of issues, issues visually mapped
- Public involvement > Tools Identified, events & outreach mapped out & can be scheduled
  
- First public outreach event > Engage public early in the process and build agreements with the community
- Engineering 101 > Build common language

After presenting the work plan outline, Margot polled the CDCT for any questions or comments. A discussion about the work plan and its individual elements followed.

It was suggested that the “Engineering 101” piece should occur earlier in the process to give CDCT members a better understanding of engineering language and process. City staff responded that this piece could come earlier and is flexible.

Another CDCT member asked when the group would talk more specifically about budgeting and project costs. City staff replied that dollar amounts will arise with specific design pieces.

One member commented that the outline presented was a good starting point and questioned what was included in a physical survey. It was suggested that during the CSS process, engineering and design info is paired with specific pieces. In other words, information and tutorials will occur concurrently or directly before they are needed for specific pieces of the process.

Another member noted that the transportation subcommittee wants to complete a neighborhood survey to reach a starting point for the process. City staff responded by stating that a survey (questionnaire) is one of many outreach tools available to the CDCT and that some tools are better suited than others in reaching desired goals and outcomes. Another CDCT member suggested using language that differentiates between a physical engineering survey and a survey of community opinion. City staff agreed to use language that differentiates the two.

Another member asked to see where the allocated \$240,000 project budget was being spent on specific work plan elements and how the City came up with the initial cost estimate. City staff responded that the cost estimate came from an experienced engineer assigned to this project and another consultant. City staff will bring a matrix of dollar costs for the project. A CDCT member suggested that “some budget must go to hard engineering costs and the City should bring a matrix with available discretionary dollars.” “One option would be to bring an upside down thermometer to show how much of the pot is being spent.” In reference to budgeting, one member suggested the addition of a capital project financing 101 piece to the work plan outline.

In response, another CDCT member asked whether there was money available to hire a private consultant, a CSS expert, to get a second opinion. City staff suggested that it would be possible to hire an outside expert; however “during the process we want to keep the CDCT informed of project costs. We are hopeful that the CDCT and City staff can come up with a design. If we hit an impasse later on, we may consider the option of hiring a consultant.”

In reference to the place making piece, a CDCT member noted that assumptions about the process should be surfaced. Margot suggested that the group discuss thoughts and assumptions about placemaking. Fred Lorish initiated the place making discussion by explaining to the group about his personal anecdotes and assumptions about the neighborhood. Fred noted that he focused on those qualitative aspects defining the neighborhood for him. He suggested that the CDCT should question assumptions about Americans with Disabilities Act requirements and that CDCT members focus on qualitative aspects of the neighborhood for this activity.

City staff responded that placemaking and issues identification activities occurring early in the process will provide opportunities to identify and discuss qualitative aspects of the neighborhood. During the design stage, questions about standards and guidelines will be addressed.

Members of the CDCT brought up the idea of creating a unique theme for the neighborhood. Ideas for themes included tying it to the Wayne Morse Ranch, historic roads, or other unique neighborhood characteristics.

In regard to the work plan outline, one member noted concern that the “front-end” of the schedule was driving the “back-end” as a top-down model. They suggested that the neighborhood should not have to decide between five alternatives originating directly from the CDCT. City staff responded that the public involvement plan would run throughout the entire CSS process and may include anything from weekly coffees to broader monthly workshops. The CDCT will create the public involvement plan (PIP) weaving it through the whole process. The integration of the PIP throughout the entire process may not have been displayed clearly on the work plan outline.

Several CDCT members proposed that City staff provide absolutes in regard to design components before the committee move forward with the placemaking activity. City staff responded that typical CSS processes use this sequencing as it is beneficial to the process. Another CDCT member suggested that moving forward without discussion on standards and guidelines is like a “snowball going downhill that is about to smash into a wall.” Some members agreed and generally questioned the relevance and necessity of ADA standards to the Crest neighborhood. City staff noted that the group should revisit assumptions that were first surfaced during the process training meetings. One assumption is “no one will use wheelchairs here.” The CDCT will have opportunities to meet with other stakeholders who may call us on our assumptions. One CDCT member replied that those stakeholders had already been involved during the formation of the CDCT and had decided not participate as CDCT members. City staff noted that the CDCT must still bring them into the discussion at some point during the process.

After discussion about stakeholders and standards, the group began discussing the placemaking activity again. Concerns were raised that CDCT members would go through the placemaking activity only to find their ideas blocked by standards and guidelines. City staff responded that placemaking was not the act of designing streets, but rather the act of gathering data and information (qualitative and quantitative) that will feed into the design. CDCT members noted that placemaking still seemed fuzzy. The conversation continued with general discussion about surfacing members’ values, physically surveying data points identified by members (trees for example), and decision making using the consensus model during the design phase.

The conversation moved back to standards and guidelines and generally included concerns that the CDCT should know existing standards early, the CDCT should be educated about technical elements of the design process and should know about any flexibility built into the standards. Several questions were posed about street right of way accuracy, tax lot accuracy, and other information that will come out of more detailed physical surveying before the design process. City staff responded that accurate right of way measurements will be obtained through physical surveying; those found online may not be accurate. City staff also noted that focusing on standards without first gathering information and concerns through placemaking will not move the group forward.

It was suggested and then agreed upon by the group that the Arterial & Collector Street Plan (ACSP) and the Street Assessment Process web pages be linked to the City of Eugene's Crest Drive web site. City staff agreed to create these links.

Margot suggested the CDCT complete a placemaking activity as homework for the next meeting. Fred Lorish suggested completing the assignment and submitting it to assigned street leaders to compile before the next meeting. Several CDCT members expressed discomfort at this suggestion, yet were supportive of the activity itself. As a compromise, submittal of the activity to assigned street leaders was made optional. Another CDCT member suggested considering two things; first, "what would you fight to keep in your neighborhood" and second, "what is your wall that would stop the snowball?"

Margot made the following proposals:

1. CDCT members will complete the placemaking assignment and will bring it to the June 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Submitting the placemaking assignment before the June 15<sup>th</sup> meeting to street representatives is optional.
2. The support group (vipers) will meet before the next CDCT meeting to go over the agenda.

The CDCT agreed with full support for these two items. Following the poll, the group developed the June 15<sup>th</sup> meeting agenda. It follows:

1. Agenda Review
2. Community Comments
3. Member Check-in
4. Group Agreements Check-in
5. Place Making Activity
6. CSS Overview
7. Public Involvement Goals and Stakeholder Identification
8. Agenda Development
9. Member Comments and Meeting Evaluation

Before closing, City staff briefly described road work that will be occurring during the summer of 2006 in the Crest Neighborhood. Several street sections will get a 1" asphalt overlay to repair the worst potholes. Information about this project can be found on the City of Eugene's Crest Drive web site.

Check-out comments included:

- We're going in the right direction
- Fun
- Good
- Welcome the opportunity to communicate

<b>Crest Drive Community Team Sign In Sheet</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>25-May</b>
Bailey, Laura	541-484-2335	✓
Calciano, Frank	541-485-3680	✓
Farkas, Paul	541-485-0859	
Gardner, Lisa	541-682-5378	✓
Gryc, Tina	541-345-2281	✓
Hawley, Sherie	541-913-2730	✓
Huestis, Hal	541-345-7286	✓
Jacobson, Cris	541-344-9924	✓
Lorish, Fred	541-341-3993	✓
McDonald, James	541-683-6027	✓
Neet, Don	541-687-0792	✓
Nielson, Clyde	541-344-4624	
Reed, Jim	541-344-7985	✓
Rowland, Mary	541-345-4195	✓
Rude, John	541-342-6427	✓
Schoening, Mark	541-682-5243	✓
Starling, Ginny	541-683-2512	✓
Stewart-Smith, Meg	541-913-5464	✓
Treadway, Cathryn	541-689-7410	✓
Verrijt, Francina	541-344-3735	✓
West, Steve	541-344-9347	
Wilken, Lyndell	541-343-3080	✓
*Bayley, Carmen	541-345-7286	✓
*Bishop, Diane		
*Donahue, Christine	541-683-8220	
*Saranpa, Kathy	541-687-7199	
*Farkas, Virginia	541-485-0859	
*Wolling, Sue		
*Alternates		

